

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/787,243		BEARD ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Kevin Mew		2664	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin Mew.

(3) James Ledbetter.

(2) Wellington Chin.

(4) Hisahiko Ueki, Shoichiro Honda, Kazuyuku Nakashima

Date of Interview: 22 June 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 73.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chillariqa et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The distinction between the prior art and claims were discussed which made clear the distinctions. Applicant agreed to file a written response containing the discussed issues. And further consideration of differences would be made.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required